



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/693,430

10/24/2003

Anders E. Klemets

MS1-1721US

2006

22801 7590 03/20/2008
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/693,430	Applicant(s) KLEMETS ET AL.	
	Examiner Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/18/07, 11/30/04, 1/2/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application filed October 24, 2003.
2. Claims 1-81 have been examined. Claims 1, 19, 33, 36, 39, 43, 48, 51, 54, 57, 60, 77, 78 and 81 are independent claims.

Priority

3. The priority date considered for this application is October 24, 2003.

Oath/Declaration

4. The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed oath/declaration filed October 24, 2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The Office acknowledges receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 18, 2007; November 30, 2004 and January 2, 2004. They have been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered.

Drawings

6. The drawings filed October 24, 2003 are accepted by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In State Street, the Federal Circuit examined some of its prior section 101 cases, observing that the claimed inventions in those cases were each for a “practical application of an abstract idea” because the elements of the invention operated to produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. For example, the court in State Street noted that the claimed invention in Alappat “constituted a practical application of an abstract idea (a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation), because it produced ‘a useful, concrete and tangible thing – the condition of a patient’s heart.’” Id.

In determining whether the claim is for a “practical application,” the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result is “useful, tangible and concrete.” The Federal Circuit further ruled that it is of little relevance whether a claim is directed to a machine or process for the purpose of a § 101 analysis. AT&T, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1451.

In this instance, it is unclear as to what the final result of the steps taken in claim 48. Claim 48 recites the steps of receiving a first stream and concurrently receiving a second stream but there is no act performed on the first and second streams to produce a result that is useful, concrete and tangible.

9. Claims 60-76 and 77-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 60 recites a system comprising a first interface, an announcement generator, a mapper and a second interface. These components are merely software components, i.e., computer program per se. Such claimed matter, which is functional descriptive material per se, is not statutory because it is not a physical “thing” nor a statutory process as there are no “acts” being performed. Such claimed computer program does not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the computer’s program’s functionality to be realized. Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the program itself is not a process, without the computer-readable storage medium needed to realize the computer’s functionality. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable storage medium encoded with a computer program defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the medium which permit the computer program’s functionality to be realized, and is thus mandatory. *Warmerdam*, 33 F.2d at 1361, 31 USPQ 2d at 1760. *In re Sarkar*, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 178). See MPEP §2106 (IV)(B)(1)(a).

10. Claims 19-35, 43-47, 51-53, 57-59 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

These claims recite a computer-accessible medium which can be interpreted as a computer-readable medium. The computer-readable medium is defined in Applicants’ disclosure in [0078] to include “communication media” which in [0080] can include wireless media. Wireless media is a form of energy, has no physical

structure and does not perform any useful, concrete and tangible result. Therefore, wireless media does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-8, 11-12, 14, 19-26, 29-30, 32-57, 60-65, 69-70, 72 and 77-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,845,300 to Agraharam et al. (“Agraharam”) in view of SDP: Session Description Protocol by Handley & Jacobson (“HandJac”) (HandJac was cited by Applicants).

Claim 1

Agraharam discloses at least *a method, comprising:*

receiving data of a multimedia presentation, wherein the data includes a first plurality of streams (see at least Abstract; 3:1-27; FIG. 4, step 410; and FIG. 7, step 510; it is noted that data of a multimedia can comprise a plurality of streams – e.g., video, audio, text); *and*

multicasting a second plurality of streams that includes added content such translated content to the received stream to a first stream selected from the first plurality of streams (see at least Abstract; 3:1-27; FIG. 4, step 450; and FIG. 7,

step 540; it is noted that the first stream selected from the first plurality of streams can be the audio data to be translated).

Agraharam does not specifically disclose that the second plurality of streams:

includes a dedicated announcement stream, wherein the announcement stream includes presentation description information of the multimedia presentation.

However, in an analogous art, HandJac discloses a session description protocol that is used to convey information about media streams in multimedia sessions for the purpose of providing participants of multimedia session with sufficient information to participate in the session (see at least sections 4-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enhance the content of the first multimedia session stream in Agraharam with the session description as taught by Handjac because this would provide participants of multimedia session with sufficient information to participate in the session.

Claim 19

Since Claim 19 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of method Claim 1, the rejection of Claim 1 also applies to Claim 19.

Claim 33

Since Claim 33 is computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of Claims 7 (1+7), the rejection of Claims 7 (1+7) also applies to Claim 33.

Claim 36

Since Claim 36 is a method claim version of Claim 33, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 36.

Claim 39

Since Claim 39 is an independent claim that recites the same limitations of Claims 1 and 3, the same rejections thereof also apply to Claim 39.

Claim 43

Since Claim 43 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of Claim 39, the same rejection thereof also applies.

Claim 48

Since Claim 48 is an independent claim that recites the same steps of method claim 39, the same rejection thereof also applies.

Claim 51

Since Claim 51 is a computer-accessible medium having computer-executable instructions (see at least FIG. 3) to perform the same steps of Claim 48, the same rejection thereof also applies.

Claim 54

Since Claim 54 is an independent claim that recites the same steps of Claim 48 and 7, the same rejections thereof also apply.

Claim 57

Since Claim 57 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of method claim 54, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 57.

Claim 60

Since Claim 60 is a system version of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 60.

Claim 77

Since Claim 77 is an independent claim that recites the same limitations of Claim 61 which depends from claim 60, the same rejections thereof also apply to Claim 77.

Claim 78

Since Claim 78 is a means-plus-function version of Claim 60, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 78.

Claim 81

Since Claim 81 is a computer-accessible medium (see at least FIG. 3) version of Claim 78, the same rejection also applies to Claim 81.

Claims 2 and 20

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams are multicast on different channels* (Agraharam; see at least 5:36-37).

Claims 3, 21, 61 and 79

Rejections of respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams is multicast on predetermined different channels* (Agraharam; see at least 5:36-37).

Claims 4, 22, 40, 44 and 62

Rejections of respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the predetermined different channels comprise predetermined logical addresses* (HandJac; subsections 4.1, 5.1).

Claims 5, 23, 41, 45 and 63

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the predetermined logical addresses are predetermined internet protocol (IP) addresses with predetermined ports* (HandJac; subsection 5.1).

Claims 6, 24, 46 and 64

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the predetermined different channels comprise predetermined ports of a logical address* (Agraharam; see at least 5:1-20; 6:15-23; FIG. 6).

Claims 7, 25, 65 and 80

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises a second stream that includes a plurality of units of data of the multimedia presentation, the plurality of units each comprising a preselected number of previous subunits of data of the multimedia presentation* (see at least 5:55 6:6; 6:31-52).

Claims 8, 26, 34, 37 and 66

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. further discloses *wherein each unit of the plurality of units includes a key frame* (HandJac; subsection 5.1, e.g., when format of the media is MPEG video, the key frame is the I-frame which is the distinguishing frame from the background frame).

Claims 11, 29 and 69

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of multimedia data in different languages* (Agraharam; see at least 2:8-15).

Claims 12, 30 and 70

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises a stream of data to be used by an application running on a client receiving the second plurality of streams* (Agraharam; see at least 2:33-38).

Claims 14, 32 and 72

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the announcement stream includes security information* (HandJac; see at least subsection 5.3).

Claim 38

The rejection of the base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac does not specifically disclose *wherein the plurality of units of the second stream each includes enough data to reduce the amount of time needed by a multimedia player to begin playback of the multimedia presentation*.

However, this claimed feature is deemed inherent to multimedia streaming taught by the combination Agraharam-HandJac because in the art, streaming is defined as:

Data streaming, commonly used in the terms "audio streaming" or "video Streaming" is when data moves from one computer to another and doesn't have to be completely downloaded for the receiving computer to do something with it.

www.greyfoxwebworks.com/webterms.html

Without allowing the multimedia player to begin playback as soon as the enough data is received by the player, real-time processing of multicast information stream taught by the combination Agraharam-HandJac would not be operative and make no sense.

Claim 35

Since claim 35 is a computer-accessible medium of Claim 38, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 35.

Claim 42

The rejection of the base claim is incorporated. Since Claim 42 recites *wherein the first stream is an announcement stream containing presentation description information* which is the limitation b of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 42.

Claim 47

The rejections of the base and intervening claims are incorporated. Since Claim 47 recites the same limitation b of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 47.

Claims 49 and 52

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *terminating reception of the second stream; and selectively receiving a third stream on a third channel selected in response to presentation description information received from the first stream, wherein the third stream comprises another stream of multimedia data of the multimedia presentation being multicast* (Agraharam; see at least 5:22-43; it is noted that Agraharam's disclosure of "the enhanced stream may also be sent to the user's PC 110 at the conclusion of the information stream, if desired" is that the translated content is multicast as a second stream – user's PC 110 can be more than one -- to

one or more of the users who chooses to receive the text version of the translated version which can be attached to the end of the second stream, as the third stream).

Claims 50 and 53

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *continuing reception of the second stream in response to presentation description information received from the first stream indicating that the second stream meets preselected criteria* (Agraharam; see at least 5:66 – 6:6; 7:40-50).

Claim 55

The rejection of base claim is incorporated. Since Claim 55 recites the same limitation b of Claim 1, the same rejection thereof also applies to Claim 55.

Claims 56 and 59

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac further discloses *wherein the second channel is preselected* (HandJac; subsection 5.1).

13. Claims 13, 31 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Agraharam-HandJac, as applied to the respective base claim, in

view of RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications by Schulzrinne et al. (“Schulzrinne”) (cited by Applicants).

Claims 13, 31 and 71

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac does not specifically disclose *wherein the announcement stream includes error correction information*.

However, in an analogous art, Schulzrinne discloses that an RTP (which is specified in the announcement stream SDP -- see at least HandJac, subsection 5.1) header contains a sequence number that can be used for error correction because the sequence number is used by a receiver to detect packet loss and to restore packet sequence (Schulzrinne, “sequence number”, p. 14).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the RTP header’s sequence number in the announcement string of the combination Agraharam-HandJac in order to take advantage of the inherent error correction of the RTP protocol.

14. Claims 15-16, 18, 73-74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Agraharam-HandJac, as applied to the respective base claim, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0128342 by Maes et al. (“Maes”).

Claims 15 and 73

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac does disclose the announcement stream (HandJac; sections 4-5)

but does not specifically disclose the remaining features of features of Claims 15 and 73.

However, in an analogous art, Maes discloses *wherein stream is multicast on an out-of-band channel* (see at least [0019], [0028], [0034]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the capability of Maes to transmit encoded meta information using in-band or out-of-band in the combination Agraharam-HandJac because this would provide users with information describing a user interface that enables users to control and manipulate streamed content, control presentation of the multimedia application.

Claims 16 and 74

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the announcement stream is multicast on an in-band channel* (Maes; see at least [0019], [0028]).

Claims 18 and 76

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes further discloses *wherein the announcement stream is multicast so that announcement stream data is included in a packet containing multimedia presentation data* (HandJac; see at least subsection 4.1).

15. Claims 9-10, 27-28 and 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Agraharam-HandJac, as applied to the respective base claim, in view of IP Multicast in RealSystem G2 by Thomas (cited by Applicants).

Claims 9, 27 and 67

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of video data having different bit rates*.

Since Agraharm discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream may contain additional video data that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac because the knowledge of Thomas teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac.

Claims 10 and 28

The rejection of respective base claim is incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of audio data having different bit rates.*

Since Agraharm discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream contains additional audio data (e.g., translated information in addition to original information -- 2:8-15) that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac because the knowledge of Thomas teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac.

Claim 67

The rejections of the base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises streams of video data having different bit rates selected from the first plurality of streams.*

Since Agraharm discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream may contain additional video data that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac because the knowledge of Thomas teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac.

Claim 68

The rejections of the base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac does not specifically disclose *wherein the second plurality of streams further comprises multiple streams of audio data having different bit rates selected from the first plurality of streams.*

Since Agraharm discloses an enhanced multimedia stream to be multicast (see at least Abstract), the second multicast information stream contains additional audio data (e.g., translated information in addition to original information -- 2:8-15) that may have different bandwidth.

However, in an analogous art, Thomas discloses that clients choose the stream to tune in to based on the bandwidth preference setting and that the more scalable multicast bitrates clients choose to encode the more bandwidth is used.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Thomas regarding multicast bitrate in the combination Agraharam-HandJac because the knowledge of Thomas

teachings would be beneficial in multicasting the enhanced multicast information stream taught in the combination Agraharam-HandJac.

16. Claims 17 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Agraharam-HandJac, as applied to the respective base claim, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0128342 by Maes et al. (“Maes”), further in view of RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications by Schulzrinne et al. (“Schulzrinne”) (cited by Applicants).

Claims 17 and 75

Rejections of the respective base and intervening claims are incorporated. The combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes does disclose RTP but does not specifically disclose *wherein the announcement stream is multicast to conform to a real-time transport control protocol (RTCP), the announcement stream being interspersed in-band within a stream of multimedia presentation data that are multicast to conform to a real-time transport protocol (RTP).*

However, in an analogous art, Schulzrinne discloses that the one of the advantages of using RTCP – RTP Control Protocol – which is based on the periodic transmission of control packets to all participants in a session in addition to RTP -- Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications – is to provide feedback on the quality of the data distribution (see at least subsection 6.1 at page 19).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings disclosed by the Schulzrinne reference in the combination Agraharam-HandJac-Maes for the advantage discussed above.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 7:00 – 17:30.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, John Miller can be reached at (571) 272-7353.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2600 Group receptionist: 571-272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoang-Vu Antony Nguyen-Ba/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

March 14, 2008